

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12 were pending. In this amendment, no claims were cancelled and claims 1, 3, 4 and 10 are amended. Therefore, claims 1-12 remain pending.

In the Office Action, claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentably obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,256,623 to Jones in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,675,205 to Meadway et al. (hereinafter "Meadway") (for claims 1-3) and over Jones and Meadway in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,233,575 to Agrawal et al. (hereinafter "Agrawal") (for claims 4-12).

The Examiner also rejected claims 3-9 under 35 USC §112, ¶2, citing to language of claims 3 and 4. In response, Applicant corrected an error in claim 3, wherein "guest query" should have been "guest content" and amended portions of claim 4 to overcome the Examiner's objections. Applicant submits that these amendments are fully responsive to the Examiner's rejection and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Claim 4 is also amended to avoid ambiguity between the two claimed indexable structures.

Cited References

Jones teaches network search access constructs referred to as search clips. Search clips can be displayed in place on a web page. Search criteria entered into a search clip can be translated based on a predetermined set of search rules to execute the search. The search clips can be stored in a database and indexed using identifiers, tags identifying search words or topics that the clip is related to, etc. By using search clips, segment specific searches can be done for different types of searches. Those segment specific searches can be entered using segments specific to the search clip type. As shown in the figures of Jones, a user can choose an unstructured search (see item 330 in Fig. 3 of Jones, for example) or a more structured search (such as those provided in the upper portion of frame 342 in Fig. 3 of Jones).

Meadway describes a peer-to-peer service that provides centralized searches where the searches are done against peer systems known to contain the requested data. If a particular peer known to contain the requested data is off-line, a central server will queue the search until a particular peer is on-line.

Agrawal describes a system for generating a taxonomy for a set of documents and using that taxonomy for classifying those documents.

Cited References Distinguished

Claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited references as those references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each element of claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify that the search query to a search engine to search guest content is dependent upon the host content obtained in the obtaining step. At least this element is not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

In the previous response, Applicant argued that the references could not be combined and the Examiner disagreed. While not conceding the point, Applicant notes that the claims can still be differentiated over the combination of Jones, Meadway and Agrawal.

Jones does not disclose formulating a search query based on the host content, as the Examiner concedes.

The Examiner cites to Meadway, col. 3, lines 35-40 and col. 6, lines 16-28 as teaching formulating a search query based on host content. As explained in reference to embodiments shown in the specification of the present application, queries for searching guest content can be generated by a computer system from summaries of host content. While Meadway may show directing a query to a particular host and processing queries received over the Internet, but those queries are generated by remote users and are not based on the host content. Instead, the search queries are dependent on what the remote user submits as a search query. Thus, there does not appear to be any suggestion in Meadway to generate a query from content, but rather to merely receive the queries from users and process them accordingly.

Since the combination of Jones and Meadway would not disclose or suggest each element of claim 1, the rejection should be withdrawn. However, for completeness, Agrawal will also be addressed. Agrawal also fails to disclose or suggest at least the claimed "formulating a search query based on the host content, wherein the search query is dependent upon the host content obtained". There, the user is responsible for formulating the search query

based on what the user wants to find. In addition, Agrawal does not have the concept of host content and guest content.

As claim 1 is allowable over the cited references, that claim is allowable and the rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 2-3 are allowable at least as depending from allowable claim 1.

Claim 4 is allowable over the cited references as those references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each element of claim 4. For example, claim 4 recites, among other elements, “distilling the host content to derive host content summary data representing a summarization of the host content” and “storing guest content in a second indexable structure, the second indexable structure configured such that a search query derived from the host content summary data for the host content requested can be applied as a search against the second indexable structure to retrieve guest content related to the host content requested...”.

Jones does not disclose or suggest search queries derived from host content summary data, or for that matter, search queries derived from host content. Jones’ “search clips” are templates for searching/display. They are not derived from or otherwise dependent upon host content. In the Jones system, search queries are entered by users. See, for example, Jones at col. 3, lines 56-64.

Meadway does not disclose or suggest those elements lacking from Jones, as the Examiner admits.

Agrawal does not disclose or suggest those elements either, as users of the Agrawal system determine the search queries, not any host content and therefore there is no structure in Agrawal that could be said to be the claimed second indexable structure.

For at least these reasons, claim 4, and claims 5-9 dependent therefrom, are allowable over the cited references and the rejection should be withdrawn.

As for claim 10, Applicant submits that it is distinct from claim 4 and a rejection that might apply to claim 4 would not always apply to claim 10: Claim 10 was amended to fix a simply typographical error that does not relate to the scope of the claim. Claim 10 recites a content display including “guest content that is obtained over the network and is determined in

part by the results of a search of a guest content corpus done following receipt of the request by a host server wherein the search of the guest content corpus is based on search parameters that are based at least in part on a host content summary and the host content summary is based at least in part on a taxonomy path representing a node in a host content taxonomy with which the requested host content is associated, and terms in a host content dictionary with which the requested host content is associated” (emphasis added). As described using embodiments in the specification of the present application, host content might be associated with a node of a taxonomy and the path to that node used to create a host content summary summarizing that host content and the summary is used in the process of creating search parameters for the search of the guest content. This is distinct from instances where a search is entirely driven by what the user inputs.

Jones does not disclose or suggest searching guest content based on search parameters that are based at least in part on a host content summary, as search queries are entered by users.

Meadway does not disclose or suggest those elements lacking from Jones. While Meadway may show directing a query to a particular host and processing queries received over the Internet, those queries are generated by remote users and are not based on a host content summary. Instead, the search queries are dependent on what the remote user submits as a search query.

Agrawal does not disclose or suggest those elements either, as users of the Agrawal system determine the search queries, not any host content summary, thus any searches would not be based on search parameters that are based at least in part on a host content summary.

For at least these reasons, claim 10, and claims 11-12 dependent therefrom, are allowable over the cited references and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/816,456
Amdt. dated October 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 28, 2005

PATENT


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Dated: 6/24/05

Respectfully submitted,


Philip H. Albert
Reg. No. 35,819

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400 Fax: 650-326-2422
PHA:djb
60490622 v1